

the end of the presentation.

Demis Hassbis should know AlphaGo is not the optimal solution for Go games. What is wrong in the so called "Universal Approximator" should be studied if AlphaGo cannot pass certain fair and strict experiments, or if it even refuses to take the experiments [*].

In mathematics, Hilbert's program failed due to Gödel theorems.

If Demis Hassbis refuses to take strict and fair experiments on AlphaGo, but advocates AGI as a meta solution or One Model to Learn Them All, it would be more misleading to sciences, and could destroy the experimental bases in other research areas, thus cause huge disasters in future.

Should Nature magazine encourage such a wrong movement ?

Parts of Demis Hassbis' problems are due to his ignorance in the histories of both sciences and Go games.

[*] I design these experiments specifically for AlphaGo (due to its leading position, the Nature paper, and the claims from Demis Hassbis that it is a scientific, generic, not pre-programmed solution, etc.) so some of the claims could be tested, and human players could have fair chances to compete with AlphaGo and study it. It is improper to retire AlphaGo now in such a situation.

Repeatability is not the only requirement for sciences. I only question the scientific aspect of AlphaGo with experiments, not the game aspect. Actually many years ago I already started to believe that computer Go software could defeat top human players, according to my intelligence theory. Just some claims about AlphaGo should be tested, especially after Nature published the AlphaGo paper. The first round experiments should be done with AlphaGo, to test its claims effectively. After that I welcome other computer Go softwares to participate the experiments. These experiments would not ask Go software makers to reveal their business secrets.